

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,502	01/15/2004	David Benderly	BENDERLY	6160
156	INER			
KIRSCHSTE & SCHIFFMI	EIN, OTTINGER, ISRA	HEINRICH, S	HEINRICH, SAMUEL M	
489 FIFTH AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NY 10017		1725	

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/758,502	BENDERLY, DAV	ID .		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Samuel M. Heinrich	1725			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	dress		
A SHO WHIC - Exten after: - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISTRICT STATES AND THE MAILING DEPLY WITH THE MAILING THE MAI	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•				
	•	action is non-final.				
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 30 and 32-37 is/are pending in the apda of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 30 and 32-37 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application	on Papers					
9) <u></u> □ 10)⊠ 1	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
3) 🔲 Infom	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) · No(s)/Mail Date	——————————————————————————————————————		D-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/758,502

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh. Langan describes (column 1, lines 36-47) well known label manufacture and label shipping and subsequent label use at a site separate from the manufacture site. Langan does not describe applying stencils and subsequent marking objects. Yueh describe a well known stencil filled with fusible material such as metal. The use of a stencil such as disclosed by Yueh with a manufacture and shipping technique such as described by Langan would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the stencil can be produced at one site and used at a different site intended for a different production.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of USPN 3,464,617 to Raynes et al. Raynes et al describe well known adhesive application of a perform carrier to a work piece. The use of such adhesive application would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the location of the coating material can be easily controlled.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of USPN 4,179,322 to Brown et al. Brown describes the use of a cover layer and the use thereof with a carrier a marking material would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the cover protects the work piece prior to the use thereof.

Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). AAPA describes (Specification, Description of the Related Art) related art which discloses well known application of marking material to diamonds including custom inscriptions and graphics. The use of a diamond workpiece with a marking process would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because marking of diamonds for identification has been done at least for decades.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited art pertains to transfer features.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30 and 32-37 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/758,502 Page 4

Art Unit: 1725

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725

Samuel M. Heinrich